






Participant profile


Please note that the data presented are based on only six months of data and not a full year.



Service provider indicators





Plan utilisation



Note: A utilisation rate may be above 100% due to the fungibility of core supports. This refers to the ability of participants to use their funding flexibly between different support types, albeit within certain limitations.

Outcomes framework



Support category summary

Support category	Active participants with approved plans	Active providers	Participants per provider	Provider concentration	Provider growth	Provider shrinkage	Total plan budgets (\$m)	Payments (\$m)	Utilisation	Outcomes indicator on choice and control	Has the NDIS helped with choice and control?
Core											
Consumables	587	25	23.5	96%	0%	0%	0.7	0.3	52%	52%	68%
Daily Activities	533	31	17.2	93%	17%	6%	17.2	13.9	81%	49%	72%
Community	546	28	19.5	93%	7%	14%	5.6	3.1	54%	48%	71%
Transport	410	10	41.0	100%	0%	0%	0.5	0.4	77%	45%	75%
Core total	796	50	16.0	92%	9%	14%	24.0	17.7	74%	51%	70%
Capacity Building											
Daily Activities	888	47	18.9	84%	43%	14%	4.4	1.4	32%	51%	69%
Employment	83	7	11.9	100%	0%	100%	0.5	0.1	29%	54%	71%
Relationships	69	9	7.7	100%	0%	0%	0.3	0.1	30%	20%	78%
Social and Civic	149	18	8.3	93%	33%	33%	0.5	0.2	41%	49%	65%
Support Coordination	453	39	11.6	82%	20%	0%	0.8	0.4	48%	43%	69%
Capacity Building total	908	77	11.8	77%	25%	25%	6.9	2.6	37%	50%	69%
Capital											
Assistive Technology	209	28	7.5	76%	25%	75%	1.3	0.5	39%	59%	68%
Home Modifications	36	2	18.0	100%	0%	0%	0.1	0.0	7%	39%	79%
Capital total	224	29	7.7	75%	25%	75%	1.4	0.5	36%	55%	69%
Missing	0	0	0.0	0%	0%	0%	0.0	0.0	0%	0%	0%
All support categories	923	105	8.8	88%	20%	13%	32.4	20.8	64%	51%	69%

Note: Only the major support categories are shown. Note: A utilisation rate may be above 100% due to the fungibility of core supports. This refers to the ability of participants to use their funding flexibly between different support types, albeit within certain limitations.

Indicator definitions


- Active participants with approved plans**: Number of active participants who have an approved plan and reside in the service district / have supports relating to the support category in their plan
- Active providers**: Number of providers that received payments for supports provided to participants within the service district / support category, over the exposure period
- Participants per provider**: Ratio between the number of active participants and the number of active providers
- Provider concentration**: Proportion of provider payments over the exposure period that were paid to the top 10 providers
- Provider growth**: Proportion of providers for which payments have grown by more than 100% compared to the previous exposure period. Only providers that received more than \$10k in payments in both exposure periods have been considered
- Provider shrinkage**: Proportion of providers for which payments have shrunk by more than 25% compared to the previous exposure period. Only providers that received more than \$10k in payments in both exposure periods have been considered
- Total plan budgets**: Value of supports committed in participant plans for the exposure period
- Payments**: Value of all payments over the exposure period, including payments to providers, payments to participants, and off-system payments (in-kind and Younger People In Residential Aged Care (YPIRAC))
- Utilisation**: Ratio between payments and total plan budgets
- Outcomes indicator on choice and control**: Proportion of participants who reported in their most recent outcomes survey that they choose who supports them
- Has the NDIS helped with choice and control?**: Proportion of participants who reported in their most recent outcomes survey that the NDIS has helped with choice and control

The green dots indicate the top 10% of service districts / support categories when ranked by performance against benchmark for the given metric – in other words – performing relatively well under the metric under consideration. The red dots indicate the bottom 10% of service districts / support categories when ranked by performance against benchmark for the given metric – in other words – performing relatively poorly under the metric under consideration.




Note: For some metrics – 'good' performance is considered a higher score under the metric. For example, high utilisation rates are considered a sign of a functioning market where participants have access to the supports they need. For other metrics, a 'good' performance is considered a lower score under the metric. For example, a low provider concentration is considered a sign of a competitive market.

Participant profile

Please note that the data presented are based on only six months of data and not a full year.





Service provider indicators



Plan utilisation



Outcomes framework



Support category summary

Support category	Active participants with approved plans	Active providers	Participants per provider	Provider concentration	Provider growth	Provider shrinkage	Total plan budgets (\$m)	Payments (\$m)	Utilisation	Outcomes indicator on choice and control	Has the NDIS helped with choice and control?
Core											
Consumables	42	7	6.0	100%	0%	0%	0.1	0.1	58%	16%	86%
Daily Activities	52	13	4.0	100%	0%	13%	5.6	5.3	95%	15%	91%
Community	42	9	4.7	100%	0%	20%	1.0	0.6	56%	16%	86%
Transport	43	5	8.6	100%	0%	0%	0.1	0.0	58%	16%	89%
Core total	55	18	3.1	99%	0%	11%	6.7	5.9	88%	15%	91%
Capacity Building											
Daily Activities	56	14	4.0	93%	0%	0%	0.3	0.1	24%	15%	91%
Employment	3	1	3.0	100%	0%	0%	0.0	0.0	40%	33%	100%
Relationships	12	3	4.0	100%	0%	0%	0.0	0.0	60%	10%	100%
Social and Civic	5	2	2.5	100%	0%	0%	0.0	0.0	37%	33%	100%
Support Coordination	45	13	3.5	92%	0%	0%	0.1	0.0	39%	12%	89%
Capacity Building total	56	27	2.1	73%	50%	0%	0.5	0.2	33%	15%	91%
Capital											
Assistive Technology	20	11	1.8	99%	0%	0%	0.2	0.1	63%	20%	100%
Home Modifications	16	0	0.0	0%	0%	0%	0.1	0.0	0%	6%	100%
Capital total	32	11	2.9	99%	0%	0%	0.3	0.1	46%	16%	100%
Missing	0	0	0.0	0%	0%	0%	0.0	0.0	0%	0%	0%
All support categories	56	43	1.3	97%	10%	10%	7.5	6.2	83%	15%	91%

Note: Only the major support categories are shown.
Note: A utilisation rate may be above 100% due to the fungibility of core supports. This refers to the ability of participants to use their funding flexibly between different support types, albeit within certain limitations.


Indicator definitions	Description
Active participants with approved plans	Number of active participants who have an approved plan and reside in the service district / have supports relating to the support category in their plan
Active providers	Number of providers that received payments for supports provided to participants within the service district / support category, over the exposure period
Participants per provider	Ratio between the number of active participants and the number of active providers
Provider concentration	Proportion of provider payments over the exposure period that were paid to the top 10 providers
Provider growth	Proportion of providers for which payments have grown by more than 100% compared to the previous exposure period. Only providers that received more than \$10k in payments in both exposure periods have been considered
Provider shrinkage	Proportion of providers for which payments have shrunk by more than 25% compared to the previous exposure period. Only providers that received more than \$10k in payments in both exposure periods have been considered
Total plan budgets	Value of supports committed in participant plans for the exposure period
Payments	Value of all payments over the exposure period, including payments to providers, payments to participants, and off-system payments (in-kind and Younger People in Residential Aged Care (YPIRAC))
Utilisation	Ratio between payments and total plan budgets
Outcomes indicator on choice and control	Proportion of participants who reported in their most recent outcomes survey that they choose who supports them
Has the NDIS helped with choice and control?	Proportion of participants who reported in their most recent outcomes survey that the NDIS has helped with choice and control

The green dots indicate the top 10% of service districts / support categories when ranked by performance against benchmark for the given metric – in other words – performing relatively well under the metric under consideration
The red dots indicate the bottom 10% of service districts / support categories when ranked by performance against benchmark for the given metric – in other words – performing relatively poorly under the metric under consideration





Note: For some metrics – 'good' performance is considered a higher score under the metric. For example, high utilisation rates are considered a sign of a functioning market where participants have access to the supports they need.
For other metrics, a 'good' performance is considered a lower score under the metric. For example, a low provider concentration is considered a sign of a competitive market.

Participant profile


Please note that the data presented are based on only six months of data and not a full year.



Service provider indicators





Plan utilisation



Note: A utilisation rate may be above 100% due to the fungibility of core supports. This refers to the ability of participants to use their funding flexibly between different support types, albeit within certain limitations.

Outcomes framework



Support category summary

Support category	Active participants with approved plans	Active providers	Participants per provider	Provider concentration	Provider growth	Provider shrinkage	Total plan budgets (\$m)	Payments (\$m)	Utilisation	Outcomes indicator on choice and control	Has the NDIS helped with choice and control?
Core											
Consumables	545	24	22.7	97%	0%	0%	0.6	0.3	51%	56%	67%
Daily Activities	481	28	17.2	91%	12%	0%	11.6	8.6	74%	53%	71%
Community	504	27	18.7	92%	8%	15%	4.6	2.5	54%	51%	71%
Transport	367	7	52.4	100%	0%	0%	0.5	0.4	79%	48%	74%
Core total	745	46	16.2	90%	5%	5%	17.3	11.8	68%	54%	68%
Capacity Building											
Daily Activities	832	45	18.5	85%	33%	17%	4.1	1.3	33%	54%	68%
Employment	80	7	11.4	100%	0%	100%	0.5	0.1	28%	55%	71%
Relationships	57	7	8.1	100%	0%	0%	0.3	0.1	25%	22%	75%
Social and Civic	144	18	8.0	93%	33%	33%	0.5	0.2	41%	49%	64%
Support Coordination	408	38	10.7	83%	20%	0%	0.7	0.3	49%	47%	68%
Capacity Building total	852	72	11.8	79%	20%	27%	6.4	2.4	37%	54%	68%
Capital											
Assistive Technology	189	23	8.2	78%	50%	50%	1.1	0.4	34%	64%	67%
Home Modifications	20	2	10.0	100%	0%	0%	0.0	0.0	24%	71%	70%
Capital total	192	24	8.0	76%	50%	50%	1.1	0.4	34%	64%	67%
Missing	0	0	0.0	0%	0%	0%	0.0	0.0	0%	0%	0%
All support categories	867	95	9.1	86%	16%	8%	24.8	14.6	59%	54%	68%

Note: Only the major support categories are shown.
Note: A utilisation rate may be above 100% due to the fungibility of core supports. This refers to the ability of participants to use their funding flexibly between different support types, albeit within certain limitations.

Indicator definitions	Definition
Active participants with approved plans	Number of active participants who have an approved plan and reside in the service district / have supports relating to the support category in their plan
Active providers	Number of providers that received payments for supports provided to participants within the service district / support category, over the exposure period
Participants per provider	Ratio between the number of active participants and the number of active providers
Provider concentration	Proportion of provider payments over the exposure period that were paid to the top 10 providers
Provider growth	Proportion of providers for which payments have grown by more than 100% compared to the previous exposure period. Only providers that received more than \$10k in payments in both exposure periods have been considered
Provider shrinkage	Proportion of providers for which payments have shrunk by more than 25% compared to the previous exposure period. Only providers that received more than \$10k in payments in both exposure periods have been considered
Total plan budgets	Value of supports committed in participant plans for the exposure period
Payments	Value of all payments over the exposure period, including payments to providers, payments to participants, and off-system payments (in-kind and Younger People in Residential Aged Care (YPIRAC))
Utilisation	Ratio between payments and total plan budgets
Outcomes indicator on choice and control	Proportion of participants who reported in their most recent outcomes survey that they choose who supports them
Has the NDIS helped with choice and control?	Proportion of participants who reported in their most recent outcomes survey that the NDIS has helped with choice and control

The green dots indicate the top 10% of service districts / support categories when ranked by performance against benchmark for the given metric – in other words – performing relatively well under the metric under consideration
The red dots indicate the bottom 10% of service districts / support categories when ranked by performance against benchmark for the given metric – in other words – performing relatively poorly under the metric under consideration

Note: For some metrics – 'good' performance is considered a higher score under the metric. For example, high utilisation rates are considered a sign of a functioning market where participants have access to the supports they need.
For other metrics, a 'good' performance is considered a lower score under the metric. For example, a low provider concentration is considered a sign of a competitive market.